

**REMARKS**

Applicant requests entry of the above substitute Specification and Abstract, and the amended Listing of Claims in the instant Application.

Claims 1-7 are pending. Applicant asserts that the amendments made above and discussed below constitute no new matter.

**The Substitute Specification**

Applicant provides herewith at Exhibit 1 a substitute Specification in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.52(a) and 1.125(b) and (c). The substitute Specification recites specific reference to prior German Application No. 103 14 463.3 filed March 28, 2003, as required by 35 U.S.C. §119. The substitute Specification incorporates the corrected claims into the specification. Support for the amendment is found in the claims as originally filed. The substitute Specification also corrects inadvertent typographical errors found throughout the originally filed specification. The substitute Specification also includes a substitute Abstract of less than 150 words and in compliance with MPEP §608.01(b). Applicant asserts that the substitute Specification includes no new matter.

In compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.125(b) and (c), Applicant includes, at Exhibit 2, a marked up copy of the substitute Specification (pages 1-21) showing the changes made to the Specification.

**Amendments to the Claims**

Applicant has amended claims 1-6 to correct informalities throughout the claims. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to replace “if appropriate different” with “different from each other.”

**The Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of various informalities and because the specification is not in proper idiomatic English. The Examiner has objected to the Abstract for exceeding 150 words and for containing typographical errors. Applicant submit herewith at Exhibit 1 a substitute Specification, including a substitute Abstract of less than 150 words, that corrects correcting the informalities listed by the Examiner. Applicant hereby asserts that the substitute Specification contains no new matter.

**The Objections to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to the claims because of various informalities and typographical errors. The Examiner has also objected to claim 6 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being an improper multiple dependent claim. Applicant has corrected these informalities in the new Listing of Claims submitted herewith. Claim 6 has been amended and new claim 7 has been added to correct the multiple dependency of claim 6. Applicant requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

**The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph for failing to distinctly claim the subject matter applicant views as the invention. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 because of the phrase “if appropriate different.” Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to read “different from each other.” Applicant asserts that this phrase particularly points out the subject matter.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 5 because the term “n” is allegedly unclear. Applicant submits that, as amended, the meaning of “n” is clearly expressed in the claims through the use of hyphenated wording. In section b) of claims 1 and 2, “n-known” refers to known standards. In sections c), d), and e) of claims 1 and 2, “n-unknown” refers to unknown standards. Applicant has amended claim 2 to be consistent with this meaning.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 to 5 because the phrase “for example” or “e.g.” allegedly renders the claims indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims to remove the phrase.

Applicant has also corrected any grammatical errors in the claims.

Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 2 and dependent claims 3-7 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention and should therefore be allowable.

**The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,578,932 (the “’932 patent”). The Examiner asserts that the ‘932 patent teaches a method for calibrating a vectorial network analyzer having multiple ports with

multiple measurement locations, wherein the port data is measured using reflection or transmission data; connecting the measurements ports via a switch; accurately calibrating the VNA, using models that are generated with error coefficients and the additional impedance; transferring the data in a scattering matrix; measuring the data by a thru line or short matched line connected between each possible measurement port combination; measuring the data using wave impedances of 50 Ohms; measuring a short or open circuit, and mathematically determining the reflection based on the open or short circuit terminations. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The calibration device of the '932 patent employs standards which *must be known* and the remaining ports are not taken into account. The '932 patent connects the fixed calibration standards of that apparatus (*see*, col. 16, line 60 to col. 17, line 36 of the '932 patent) for each measurement via semiconductor switches and all standards are known. *See, e.g.*, col. 10, lines 55-65; and col. 12, lines 18-22 and 49-51.


The instant invention as claimed in claim 1 is drawn to a method of calibration, wherein the calibration measurement is carried out on one port that is terminated with a reflection standard. The "n-one port" is a special one-port in the n-port VNA according to the claimed invention which takes into consideration the remaining ports of the n-port. For this purpose, all the n ports, the one "measurement port" and the n-1 remaining ports, are terminated with n reflection standards. Therefore, claims 1-5 disclose "a" measurement with "n" standards for the realization of the n-one-port. According to claims 1b) and 2b) these n standards are known but *possibly different from each other*. According to claims 1c), 1d) and 2), each of the n S- and O-standards are *unknown*. Accordingly, in view of the differences between the instant invention and the '932 patent, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-5 are not anticipated

by the '932 patent and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant believes that no fee is due in addition to the three-month extension fee, however, Applicant authorizes, in the Fee Transmittal (submitted herewith in duplicate) the Director to charge payment of any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Gary M. Butter, Reg. No. 33,841  
Attorney for Applicant

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P  
Customer No. 21003  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112  
(212) 408-2500